UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,812	07/10/2001	Andres Hejlsberg	MS1-866US	6426

22801 7590 04/04/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
CAO, DIEM K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/902,812	HEJLSBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K. Cao	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-16 and 18-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-16 and 18-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/19/05,1/17/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1,3-16 and 18-40 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 16, 18, 20-29 and 31 and cancelled claims 2 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application, that is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result". Claims 31-40 are directed to a method comprising creating a namespace with functions that enable drawing and construction of user interfaces, thus, creating a namespace does not provide a useful, concrete and tangible result, thus the claims claimed non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn et al (Web Programming with Visual J++) in view of Flanagan (Java in a Nutshell) further in view of Microsoft Corp (Delegates in Visual J++ 6.0).

6. As to claim 5, Cohn teaches an API comprising multiple types related to construction user interfaces (In Java, and applets .... Srollbars; chapter 5, page 1 and Container class; chapter 6, page 1 and through out chapters 5-6), classes which represent managed heap allocated data that has reference assignment semantics (Buttons class; chapter 5, pages 3-4).

7. However, Cohn does not explicitly teach interfaces that define a contract that other types can implement, delegates that are object oriented function pointers, structures that represent static allocated data that has value assignment semantic and enumerations which are value types that represent named constants. Flanagan teaches interfaces that define a contract that other types can implement (java.awt.fontMetrics, java.art.Graphics, java.art.Images; Fig. 19-1 and associated text; page 238), structures that represent static allocated data that has value assignment semantic (java.util.Hashtable ... data structure; page 342) and enumerations which are value types that represent named constants (java.util.Enumeration; page 342). Microsoft teaches delegates that are object oriented function pointers (page 1, first paragraph).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to integrate the teaching of Cohn, Flanagan and Microsoft because Visual J++ is based on Java, and Flanagan teaches details of classes and packages offered by Java, and Microsoft teaches delegates address many of

scenarios that are addressed by function pointers, delegates are object oriented, type safe and secure (page 2, see section How are delegates different from function pointers)

9. As to claim 6, Flanagan teaches the classes comprise a form class that represents a window or a dialog box that makes up an application's user interface (java.awt.Dialog, This class encapsulates a dialog box window … with setLayout(); page 247).

10. As to claim 7, Flanagan teaches the form class has multiple members comprising one or more of public static properties, public static methods, public instance constructors, public instance methods, public instance properties, public instance events, protected instance properties, and protected instance methods (public Dialog (Frame parent, Boolean modal), public String getTitle(); page 247).

11. As to claim 8, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise a button control interface that allows a control to act like a button on a form (java.awt.Button encapsulates a GUI pushbutton that displays a specified textual label; page 240).

12. As to claim 9, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise a container control interface that provides functionality for a control to act as a parent for other controls (java.awt.Container implements a component that can contain other components; page 246).

13. As to claim 10, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise an editing notification interface (java.awt.TextArea, java.awt.TextComponent, java.awt.TextField; pages 267-268).

14. As to claim 11, Flanagant teaches interfaces comprise a data object interface that provides a format independent mechanism for transferring data (java.awt.fontMetrics, java.art.Graphics, java.art.Images; Fig. 19-1 and associated text; page 238).

15. As to claim 12, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise a feature support interface that specifies a standard interface for retrieving feature information from a current system (System.getProperties(), Font.getFont(), Color.getColor(); page 193).

16. As to claim 13, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise a message filter interface (applet security, java.lang.SecurityManager class defines a number of methods that the system calls to check whether a certain operation is permitted in the current environment; page.199).

17. As to claim 14, Flanagan teaches the interfaces comprise a handle-exposing interface to expose handles (java.awt.Container, getComponents() returns an array of the components contained in a container; page 246).

18. As to claim 15, see rejections of claims 8-14 above.

19. As to claim 31, see rejection of claim 5 above.

20. As to claim 32-40, see rejection of claims 6-14 above.

21. As to claim 1, see rejection of claim 5 above. Cohn teaches an application configured to handle requests submitted by remote devices over a network (server programs, requests, clients; chapter 19, page 3, 2nd paragraph), and an application interface to present functions used by the application to access network and computing resources of the distributed computing system (Table 17.2; Chapter 17, page 4 and page 1).

22. As to claim 3, Cohn teaches the distributed computing system comprises client devices and server devices that handle requests from the client devices, the remote devices comprising at least one client device (chapter 19, page 1, section the Client/Server Model and page 4, The server program ... as an application).

23. As to claim 4, Cohn teaches the distributed computing system comprises client devices and server devices that handle requests from the client devices (chapter 19, page 1, section the Client/Server Model and page 4, The server program ... as an application). Cohn does not explicitly teach the remote devices comprising at least one server device that is configured as a Web server. However, web server is popular in the art of the Internet, and Cohn teaches the client/server model in the network environment, it would have been obvious a web server is also exitsted.

24. As to claim 16, see rejection of claim 1 above.

25. As to claim 28, see rejection of claim 1 above. Cohn teaches a computer system including one or more microprocessors and one or more software programs (inherent from host; chapter 19, page 1 and 4), the one or more software programs utilizing an application program interface to request services from an operating system (inherent from host; chapter 19, page 1 and 4).

26. As to claim 29, see rejection of claim 1 above.

27. As to claim 30, Cohn teaches receiving a request from a remote computing device, the request containing a call to the set of functions (chapter 19, page 3 and page 6, class Ex19aApplciationFrame).

28. As to claims 18-27, see rejections of claims 6-15 above.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-16 and 18-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Diem Cao

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER